

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated August 12, 2004, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

### *Claim Status*

Claims 1-45 were pending as of the date of the Office Action. Claims 21 and 22 stand objected to. Claims 1-45 stand rejected. Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 28, 36, 37, and 40 have been canceled. Claims 1, 7, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 34, 39, 43, and 45 have been amended. Claims 46-54 have been newly added. No new matter has been added. The amendments find support in the specification as originally filed at least in the claims as originally filed, page 9, line 13 through page 13, line 4, etc.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-20, 23-25, and 34-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,096 to Wong et al., hereinafter "Wong." Claims 30, 31, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0006787 by Darby. Claims 26 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,522,875 to Dowling et al., hereinafter "Dowling." Claims 2 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wong in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0042266 by Heyward et al., hereinafter "Heyward." Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Dowling. Claims 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Dowling. Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Darby in view of Dowling.

Applicant respectfully traverses the grounds for rejection and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-15, 19-27, 29-35, 38-39, and 41-45 in view of the following.

### *Claim Objections*

The examiner has objected to claims 20 and 21 as depending from claim 14 when it appears that they should depend from claim 15. Claims 20 and 21 have been amended to

depend from claim 15. As such, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

***Examiner Interview***

Applicant appreciates the examiner interview of September 1, 2004 in which the examiner indicated that incorporating the limitations of claims 11, 35, and 37 into the independent claims would overcome the rejections based on the cited references.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103***

Independent claims 1, 7, 15, 23, 26, 27, 30, 34, 39, 43, and 45 each include features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, either taken alone or in combination, namely as represented by claim 1:

15. (Currently Amended) A method for providing server access to a wireless communication device that communicates over a wireless network, comprising:  
*receiving an e-mail message from a wireless network, the e-mail message containing a service request indication and a location indication, the location indication indicating the location of the wireless communication device;*  
parsing the service request indication and the location indication from the e-mail message;  
determining a service request based upon the service request indication;  
determining a server capable of servicing the service request;  
requesting the service from the server;  
receiving a reply from the server in response to requesting the service, the reply being based on the service request and location indication;  
formatting the reply as a second e-mail message for communication over the wireless network; and  
sending the formatted second e-mail reply message to the wireless communication device. (emphasis added)

Claims 1, 7, 15, 23, 26, 27, 30, 34, 39, 43, and 45 are directed to various aspects of systems and methods of communication with a wireless device via an e-mail message. Claim 15 includes the feature of an e-mail message including a service request indication and a location indication. The remaining independent claims include similar features.

None of the cited references disclose an email message with both a service request indication and a location indication. Wong does not disclose or suggest an e-mail message

containing a service request indication and a location indication, the location indication indicating the location of the wireless communication device, as included in the claims. Wong discloses conventional e-mail and conventional navigation assistance (c. 4, l. 53-61). Wong, however, does not disclose or suggest an e-mail message including both a service request indication and a location indication.

Nor does Darby disclose or suggest an e-mail message containing a service request indication and a location indication, the location indication indicating the location of the wireless communication device, as included in the claims. Darby discloses conventional email at paragraph [0031], but does not disclose or suggest an e-mail message including both a service request indication and a location indication.

Nor does Dowling disclose or suggest an e-mail message containing a service request indication and a location indication, the location indication indicating the location of the wireless communication device, as included in the claims. Further, the examiner does not cite to Dowling as disclosing or suggesting an e-mail message.

Finally, Heyward does not disclose or suggest an e-mail message containing a service request indication and a location indication, the location indication indicating the location of the wireless communication device, as included in the claims. Again, the examiner does not cite to Heyward as disclosing or suggesting an e-mail message.

Accordingly, applicant submits that the cited references, either taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 7, 15, 23, 26, 27, 30, 34, 39, 43, and 45. Additionally, inasmuch as dependent claims 2-4, 8-10, 13-14, 19-22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 41, 42, and 44 (which have also been rejected) are dependent on claims 1, 7, 15, 23, 26, 27, 30, 34, 39, 43, and 45, these claims are patentable over the cited reference, at least by virtue of their dependency. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-15, 19-27, 29-35, 38-39, and 41-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

#### ***New Claims***

Claims 46-56 have been newly added. The newly added claims find support in the specification as originally filed at least from page 9, line 13 through page 13, line 4.


**DOCKET NO.:** BELL-0159/00064  
**Application No.:** 10/058,721  
**Office Action Dated:** August 12, 2004

**PATENT**

***Conclusion***

For all the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the Office Action and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Raymond N. Scott Jr. at (215) 564-8951, to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: November 12, 2004



---

Raymond N. Scott, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 48,666

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439